



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/045,607

10/23/2001

Lino Tavares

208.1004US

1029

7590 01/05/2010  
Davidson, Davidson & Kappel, LLC  
14th Floor  
485 Seventh Avenue  
New York, NY 10018

EXAMINER

GHALI, ISIS A D

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1611

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/05/2010

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/045,607	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAVARES ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Isis A. Ghali	<b>Art Unit</b> 1611	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 September 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22-24, 29, 30, 32-38 and 40-55 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22-24, 29, 30, 32-38 and 40-55 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/13/2009; 10/30/2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The receipt is acknowledged of applicants' amendment filed 09/18/2009; Ids filed 07/13/2009; and IDS filed 10/30/2009.

Claims 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 20, 22-24, 29, 30, 32-38, and 40-55 are currently pending and included in the prosecution.

**The following rejection/objection has been overcome by virtue of applicants' amendment and remarks:**

Amendment made to the specification.

**The following rejection has been discussed in details in the previous office action, and is maintained for reasons of record:**

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1611

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 20-24, 29, 30, 32-38, and 40-55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 4,910,205 ('205) in view of applicants' admission in paragraph 0123 and US 5,968,547 ('547).

The present claims 8-11, 13, 14, 16, 47, 50 and 53 are directed to method of treating seasonal allergy or chronic urticaria comprising administering to the patient a transdermal delivery system containing loratadine, and the claims recite broad plasma levels and release rates as implied by the term "about". Claims 20-24, 29, 30, 32-38, 45, 48, 51 and 54 are directed to transdermal delivery system containing loratadine and provide broad plasma levels and release rates as implied by the term "about". Claims 46, 49, 52 and 55 are directed to method of treating seasonal allergy or chronic urticaria comprising administering to the patient a transdermal delivery system containing loratadine wherein the device comprises reservoir layer consisting essentially of 20-90% polymer, 0.1-30% softening agent, 0.1-20% loratadine and 0.1-30% solvent, and the claims recite broad plasma levels and release rates as implied by the term "about".

US '205 teaches a transdermal delivery system of loratadine for the treatment of allergic conditions (abstract). The system is formed of patch applied to skin for a specific period of time to permit the penetration of a desired amount of loratadine through the

Art Unit: 1611

skin. The patch comprises a reservoir having 10-20% loratadine; 50-60% solvent; and 20-35% fatty acid esters, i.e. softening agents (col.2, lines 19-29). The patch further comprises a backing layer and a release liner (col.2, line 64; col.3, line 6). The patch will be worn from one to four days and provides a total daily dose of 0.5 to 5 mg (col.2, lines 28-34), which is from 500  $\mu\text{g}$  to 5000  $\mu\text{g}$  per day for one to four days. The reference disclosed patch size of 15  $\text{cm}^2$ , i.e. average daily released dose of 500  $\mu\text{g}/15 \text{ cm}^2/\text{day}$  to 5000  $\mu\text{g}/15 \text{ cm}^2/\text{day}$ . When the dose provided by 15  $\text{cm}^2$  patch is divided by 15 will provide the dose per  $\text{cm}^2$ , that is calculated 33.3  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{day}$  to 333  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{day}$ , which when divided by 24 will provide the hourly dose which is calculated to be 1.4  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$  to 14  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$ . The value from 1.4  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$  to 14  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$  represents the mean average release rate disclosed by the reference, and applicant claim mean average release rate from 1.8  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$  to 9.9  $\mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$ , which falls within the values disclosed by the reference. The reference disclosed that the dose may be varied depending on the size and age of the patient, and may also depend upon the severity of the condition being treated (col.3, lines 56-60). The frequency of dosage application can be once every 3 days to once every 7 days (col.4, lines 5-10). The claimed delivery rates are met by the reference because the claimed rates are broadened by the term "about" and inclusive of the rates disclosed by the prior art. The claimed plasma level of loratadine of the prior is are expected to be the same as those disclosed by the prior art since the prior art teaches the same daily and hourly delivery rate of loratadine for the same period of time as instantly claimed.

Additionally, the claimed release rates are determined by Valia-Chein cell, and the prior art is silent regarding the test method and the art does not appear to rely on, or teach the test method. The Patent Office is not equipped with test facilities for result testing. Hence, the instantly claimed release rates are met by the prior art.

The reference does not teach the specific delivery profile of loratadine, the specific amounts of different ingredients, or specific structure and formulation of a transdermal device including specific polymer, specific solvents and specific softening agents in the transdermal delivery system.

Applicants admit that the release rate for a loratadine transdermal delivery system was calculated from the available data regarding the bioavailability of the oral dose.

Further, the transdermal devices suitable to deliver active agents and their structure and constituents were all known at the time of the invention.

US '547 teaches a transdermal drug delivery device for controlled delivery of drug for 3 days and maintaining the delivery for additional 2 days in accordance to the zero order kinetic of the drug (abstract). When the drug applied transdermally, it follows the pharmacokinetics to provide its effect over prolonged period (col.4, lines 42-67, col. 5, lines 1-8). The device comprises backing layer, polymeric reservoir and protective liner (col.20, lines 17-27). The reservoir comprising: 1-90% of polymeric material, 0.1-30% of the drug, 0.1-30% softener, and 0.1-30% of solvent (col.20, lines 55-60). The polymeric material of the reservoir is pressure sensitive adhesive and contains rubber, silicone or block-copolymers (col.18, lines 55-65). The solvents used include those

Art Unit: 1611

contain at least one acidic group, particularly, monoesters of dicarboxylic acids, such as monomethyl glutarate and monomethyl adipate (col.20, lines 5-10). The softeners include medium chain triglycerides of the caprylic/capric acids or coconut oil, undecanol, octanol, and dodecanol (col.19, lines 58-68). The backing is laminate of polymer and aluminum foil (col.18, lines 25-30).

It is evident from the disclosure of US '547 that when the drug is included in the described transdermal device, the drug follows and is delivered according to its pharmacokinetics for period of 5 days as desired by applicants. The structure and formulation of the reservoir of the present transdermal device are identical to that of US '547. Applicants disclosed on the paragraph bridging page 23 and 24 that the pharmacokinetic information for oral loratadine is available in the literature and a release rate for a loratadine transdermal delivery system was calculated from the available data. Applicants also admit on page 24, first full paragraph that any type of transdermal delivery system may be used in accordance with the methods of the present invention so long as the desired pharmacokinetic are attained over at least 3 days to about 8 days.

Therefore, having available within hands the disclosure of US '205 that teaches loratadine delivered transdermally from formulation comprising solvent and softener, and US '547 that teaches drug delivery rate over 3-5 days following the pharmacokinetics of the drug and is attained by specific structure and formulation of a transdermal drug delivery system, along with the available pharmacokinetics of loratadine, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have

Art Unit: 1611

designed transdermal drug delivery device to deliver loratadine as disclosed by US '205 and use the device disclosed by US '547 and would calculate the transdermal release rates from the available pharmacokinetic data of loratadine to achieve a transdermal delivery device having the structure and reservoir formulation comprising loratadine, polymer, softener, and solvent, wherein the device delivers loratadine at a delivery rate in accordance to its pharmacokinetics to treat patients suffering from allergic reactions with great success.

The determination of the relative release rate via an in-vitro permeation test utilizing a Valia-Chien cell is known in the art and it is not part of the claimed method of treating allergic rhinitis; or even a part of the transdermal device that provide particular plasma levels of loratadine. It is only an in-vitro diagnostic test that is expected to provide the same results obtained from two similar delivery devices tested under the same circumstances, and the recitation of this in-vitro test does not impart patentability to claims directed to method of treating allergic rhinitis or claims directed to transdermal device applied to patients to provide specific plasma levels of loratadine, i.e. in vivo use.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments filed 09/18/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants traverse the Examiner statement on page 8 of the Office Action that "[t]he claimed plasma level of loratadine is/are expected to be same as those disclosed by the prior art since the prior art teaches the same daily and hourly delivery rate of loratadine for the same period of time as instantly claimed." Applicants argue that steady state plasma levels of loratadine calculated from the flux at approximate steady state of the final Gel of the Kogan reference are different and do not overlap with the plasma level of loratadine at steady state recited in independent claims 8, 20 and 46. Specifically, it was shown that the steady state loratadine concentration after



Art Unit: 1611

administration of the final Gel of the Kogan reference at approximately steady state is 0.48 ng/ml, when calculated using the first formula given in paragraph [0123] of the specification (i.e., the dosing rate is "a product of the steady state concentration of loratadine and a representative clearance rate"), or 0.69 ng/ml, when calculated using the second formula given in paragraph [0123] of the specification (i.e., the dosing rate is equal to "[t]he product of steady state concentration, volume of distribution and elimination rate constant"). These calculations clearly show that the claimed steady state plasma level of loratadine (i.e., about 3 ng/ml) is not the same as the calculated steady state loratadine concentrations for the Final Gel of the Kogan reference (i.e., 0.48 ng/ml or 0.69 ng/ml). Applicants argue that the flux rates in Table I of the Kogan reference are "at approximate steady state," rather than at "24 hours; ... 48 hours; ... 72 hours; and ... 96 hours" as recited in independent claims 8, 20 and 46. Applicants therefore submit that the Examiner's comparison is inappropriate. Applicants further argue that there is no indication in the cited references that the release profile of loratadine described in the Kogan reference is unacceptable, or that the specific release profiles recited in the present claims are desirable.

In response to these arguments, it is argued that the rejection is based on combination of Kogan with Reder, and combination of both references will provide transdermal device having loratadine in transdermal delivery system comprising polymer, softening agent, and solvent, and further combination of the references teaches the same amount of the drug and species of polymer, softening agent and solvent providing delivery for 5 days or more. Therefore, the device having the same drug and formulation for delivering the drug as taught by the combination of the references is expected to provide the same delivery rates and plasma concentrations. The claimed plasma level of loratadine is expected to be the same as those disclosed by the prior art in combination since the combined teachings of the prior art teaches the same drug in the same formulation. The steady state concentration is not only controlled by pharmacokinetics of the drug, but also by the formulation and structure of the delivering transdermal device. One cannot attack the references individually when the rejection is based on their combination.

Further, Kogan teaches that the dose of loratadine may be varied depending on the weight and age of the patient, and may also depend upon the severity of the condition being treated (col.3, lines 56-60). The frequency of dosage application according to Kogan can be once every 3 days to once every 7 days (col.4, lines 5-10). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have been able to determine the desired release rate of loratadine according to individual patient and severity of the allergic condition to be treated by manipulating the dose of loratadine and delivering formulation in view of doses and release rates disclosed by Kogan and the formulation disclosed by Reder.

Further, Kogan teaches mean average release rate from  $1.4 \mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$  to  $14 \mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$  and applicant claim mean average release rate from  $1.8 \mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$  to  $9.9 \mu\text{g}/\text{cm}^2/\text{hr}$ , which falls within the values disclosed by the reference. Further Kogan teaches release for many days. Therefore, the claimed release rates and times are met by the reference.

Further, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). Loratadine was known at the time of the invention to be administered transdermally as disclosed by Kogan. Reder taught that when the drug is included in the described transdermal device, the drug

Art Unit: 1611

follows and is delivered according to its pharmacokinetics for period of 5 days as desired by applicants. Applicants disclosed in paragraph 0123 that the release rate for a loratadine transdermal delivery system was calculated from the drug bioavailability available data. Applicants also admit in the same paragraph that any type of transdermal delivery system may be used in accordance with the methods of the present invention so long as the desired pharmacokinetic are attained over at least 3 days to about 8 days. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would deliver loratadine transdermally as taught by Kogan using the device taught by Reder and would calculate the transdermal release rates from the loratadine bioavailability available data to achieve a transdermal delivery device having the structure and reservoir formulation comprising polymer, softener, solvent and loratadine that delivers loratadine at a delivery rate in accordance to its pharmacokinetics to treat patients suffering from allergic reactions with great success. It has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir.1992). In this case, the cited prior art in the field of applicant's endeavor since both Kogan and Reder are concerned about transdermal delivery of active agents over 3-5 days following the pharmacokinetics of the drug that is attained by specific structure and formulation of a transdermal drug delivery system, and their combination is reasonable as stated above. The invention as

Art Unit: 1611

a whole is taught by the combination of the references; therefore, prima facie case of obviousness has been established in the meaning of USC 103 (a).

Applicants argue that the cited references would not have motivated a person of ordinary skill to arrive at the invention recited in present independent claims 8, 20 and 46.

In response to this argument, it is established that in considering the disclosure of the reference, it is proper to take into account not only the specific teachings of the reference but also the inferences which one skilled in the art would reasonably be expected to draw therefrom. *In re Preda*, 401 F.2d 825, 826, 159 USPQ 342, 344 (CCPA 1968). The rational to modify or to combine the prior art does not have to be expressly stated in the prior art; the rational may be expressly or impliedly contained in the prior art or it may be reasoned from knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. The reason or motivation to modify the reference may often suggest what the inventor has done, but for a different purpose or to solve different problem. It is not necessary that the prior art suggest the combination or modification to achieve the same advantage or result discovered by applicant. *In re Linter*, 458 F.2d 1013, 173 USPQ 560 (CCPA 1972). Kogan teaches loratadine administered transdermally and it is evident from the disclosure of Reder that when the drug is included in the described transdermal device, the drug follows and is delivered according to its pharmacokinetics for period of 5 days as desired by applicants. The structure and formulation of the reservoir of the present transdermal device are identical to that of Reder. Applicants disclosed in paragraph 0123 that the release rate for a

Art Unit: 1611

loratadine transdermal delivery system was calculated from bioavailability available data. Applicants also admit in the same paragraph that any type of transdermal delivery system may be used in accordance with the methods of the present invention so long as the desired pharmacokinetic are attained over at least 3 days to about 8 days. At the time of the invention, one having ordinary skill in the art looking for a structure for transdermal patch for sustained release of drug and knowing the properties of the drug intended to be delivered, would have looked at Reder's patent or any other patent delivering drug transdermally. The fact that applicant has recognized another advantage which would flow naturally from following the suggestion of the prior art cannot be the basis for patentability when the differences would otherwise be obvious. See *Ex parte Obiaya*, 227 USPQ 58, 60 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

It has been held that "When a patent simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious." *KSR Int 'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740 (2007) (quoting *Sakraida v. AG Pro, Inc.*, 425 U.S. 273,282 (1976)). "When the question is whether a patent claiming the combination of elements of prior art is obvious," the relevant question is "whether the improvement is more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions."

Applicants traverse the Examiner's statement on page 12 of the Office Action that "[w]hen a patent simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious." Applicants argue that "a plasma level of loratadine at steady state of about 3 ng/ml" is

not taught or suggested by the cited references, and the combination of the cited references does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claims 8, 20 and 46.

In response to this argument, it is argued that in view of the term "about" of the claims, the plasma levels taught by Kogan read on the claims. Kogan teaches that the dose of loratadine may be varied depending on the weight and age of the patient, and may also depend upon the severity of the condition being treated (col.3, lines 56-60). The frequency of dosage application according to Kogan can be once every 3 days to once every 7 days (col.4, lines 5-10). Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would have been able to determine the desired release rate and plasma level of loratadine according to individual patient and severity of the allergic condition to be treated by manipulating the dose of loratadine and delivering formulation in view of doses and release rates disclosed by Kogan and the formulation disclosed by Reder.

It is well established that the claims are given the broadest reasonable interpretation during examination in light of the supporting disclosure as it would be interpreted by one of ordinary skill in the art, *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023,1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997); *In re Am. Acad. of Sci. Tech. Ctr.*, 367 F.3d 1359,1364[, 70 USPQ2d 1827] (Fed. Cir. 2004). Further, it has been held that the words of the claim must be given their plain meaning unless the plain meaning is inconsistent with the specification. *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989); *Chef America, Inc. v. Lamb-Weston, Inc.*, 358 F.3d 1371, 1372, 69 USPQ2d 1857 (Fed. Cir. 2004). In the present case, the term "about 3 ng/ml" encompasses values more than the claimed value.

A conclusion of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) does not require absolute predictability, only a reasonable expectation of success; and references are evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. *In re Bozek*, 163 USPQ 545 (CCPA 1969).

In the light of the foregoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter as a whole as defined by the claims would have been prima facie obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103 (a).

### ***Conclusion***

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Isis A. Ghali whose telephone number is (571) 272-

Art Unit: 1611

0595. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 6:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Sharmila Landau can be reached on (571) 272-0614. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571)-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

IG

/Isis A Ghali/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1611